S. HRG. 98-881 PT. 2

SKILLED ENLISTED RESERVE TRAINING ACT

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 801

TO AMEND TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO ESTABLISH A PROGRAM TO PROVIDE HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES WITH TECHNICAL TRAINING IN SKILLS NEEDED BY THE ARMED FORCES IN RETURN FOR A COMMITMENT FOR ENLISTED SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

PART 2

CHARLESTON, SC

JULY 13, 1984

Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
39-188 O WASHINGTON : 1984

S201-47

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JOHN TOWER, Texas, *Chairman*

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina	SAM NUNN, Georgia
BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona	JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi
JOHN W.WARNER, Virginia	GARY HART, Colorado
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire	J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine	CARL LEVIN, Michigan
ROGER W. JEPSEN, Iowa	EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana	JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina	ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
PETE WILSON, California	

JAMES F. MCGOVERN, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
ARNOLD L. PUNARO, *Staff Director for the Minority*
ALAN R. YUSPEH, *General Counsel*
CHRISTINE C. DAUTH, *Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL

ROGER W. JEPSEN, Iowa, *Chairman*

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina	ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire	SAM NUNN, Georgia
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine	J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina	EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts

CONTENTS

Chronological List of Witnesses

	Page
Orth, Dr. William A., president, Trident Technical College, Charleston, SC	51
Martin, Mr. Montez, member, Governing Board of Trident Technical College	54
LeCroy, Dr. R. Jan, chancellor, Dallas County Community College, Dallas, TX	56
Darrow, Dr. Lyle E., vice chancellor, Alabama State Department of Postsecondary Education	61
Garrison, Dr. Don C., president, Tri-County Technical College, Pendleton, SC	66

SKILLED ENLISTED RESERVE TRAINING ACT

FRIDAY, JULY 13, 1984

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Charleston, SC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:40 a.m., at Trident Technical College, Charleston, SC, Senator Strom Thurmond presiding.

Present: Senator Thurmond.

Staff present: Patrick A. Tucker, counsel, and George K. Johnson, Jr., professional staff member.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND

The subcommittee will come to order. I have to apologize for being 10 minutes late. The traffic held us up.

We are very pleased to see so many people here, and we're glad to have you with us. Today the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel of the Senate Armed Services Committee meets to receive testimony on a bill, S. 801, the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act.

This measure is designed to help resolve the shortage of skilled technicians responsible for installing, operating, and maintaining the increasingly complex weapons systems that our Armed Forces are employing. I believe the implementation of this bill, while generating a steady flow of needed technicians in all of the services, will also produce significant savings to the country. It is an imaginative concept to train enlisted personnel in technological skills at community, technical, and junior colleges.

For the past several years, our Armed Forces have been putting in place increasingly sophisticated weaponry. The Army, for example, is deploying a new main battle tank with a computerized fire control system. The Navy is deploying the state of the art Aegis system to defend our ships from incoming missiles. Our national security, however, amounts to more than the deployment of advanced weapons systems; it requires a substantial pool of trained, skilled technicians who can install, operate, and maintain these systems.

A careful review of the military manpower situation reveals that there are pressing needs for trained specialists in many areas in the regular forces. The parallel need in the reserve components is much greater. There are severe shortages in many military occupational specialties, including: Electronics technician, boiler technician, aviation machinist mate, tank systems mechanic, aerial survey sensor, repairman and many, many others.

The public is generally aware of the difficulty the services have encountered in recruiting and retaining enlisted personnel capable of working in high technology areas, particularly in fields where the demand in private industry also runs high. In the past few years, however, partly because of substantial pay raises granted the military by Congress and partly because of weakness in the private economy, the services have had less trouble filling their recruitment goals. As the economy improved during 1983, the recruiting trends began a noticeable decline. As an example, the Army experienced a 20-percent drop in walk-in recruits, which are those individuals who visited a recruiting station to enlist without prior contact by the Army.

These trends indicate the shortages in technicians will increase in the near future. The longer term projections, however, are even more critical. To man our Armed Forces today, the United States must recruit one out of every six males in the age category 17 to 21. Because of past reductions in the birth rate, by 1990, the United States will have to recruit one out of every three males in the age category 17 to 21. This will be particularly difficult for our Armed Forces to accomplish, because there will be a corresponding decrease in competition in the private sector for jobs that normally go to males in that age category.

Therefore, I believe the time to act is now. This legislation will provide the equivalent of a 2-year college scholarship. Each military service will offer scholarships in the field of technology that fill critical service skill requirements. Under this program, the trainee would complete basic training at a military installation, to be followed by schooling at a technical education center or community college in courses required for the specialization for which an individual enlisted. Upon successful completion of college credit, an individual would then complete a regular tour on active duty, or a longer term of enlistment in a reserve component unit. The maximum college training period will be for 2 years, and the maximum stipend would be for 18 months. The trainee would have the option to be obligated for 2 to 4 years active duty with a short Reserve obligation or 6 years in the Reserve components.

This proposal provides the military services with a valid pay back on their educational investment through an obligation after college training rather than the military obligation proceeding the education as provided by a traditional military educational incentive program.

Several major military associations have reviewed S. 801 and have endorsed it. They are: The National Guard Association of the United States, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, The Association of the United States Army, the American Legion, and the Air Force Association. There may be some others that have not come to our attention, but these have definitely endorsed it.

It is a pleasure to be here in my home State of South Carolina today to receive testimony on this legislation. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome Dr. William A. Orth, president of Trident Technical College; Mr. Montez Martin, a member of the governing board of Trident Technical College; Dr. R. Jan LeCroy, chancellor of the Dallas County Community College, Dallas, TX; Dr. Lyle Darrow, vice chancellor of the Alabama State Department

of Postsecondary Education; and Dr. Don Garrison, president of Tri-County Technical College, Pendleton, SC.

Following your remarks, I would like to have a question and answer period. Some time ago, I was talking to Dr. Garrison, and he was telling me how strongly he believed in this program.

Dr. GARRISON. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. Now, Dr. Orth we would be pleased to hear from you first if you wish to speak at this time.

STATEMENT OF DR. WILLIAM A. ORTH, PRESIDENT, TRIDENT TECHNICAL COLLEGE, CHARLESTON, SC

Dr. ORTH. Thank you, Senator Thurmond. Before I begin my testimony, I would like to take just a brief minute to welcome you to Trident Technical College and to thank you for choosing this site to hold a hearing on this extremely important bill.

It is certainly appropriate for the hearing to be held on the campus of a 2-year college, and even more so here because of the proximity of several major military installations. And it's also good to have you back at home in South Carolina, sir.

I believe the basic premise of bill S. 801 is an excellent one. Technical training in appropriate skills in return for a commitment for enlisted service in the Armed Forces is a concept that is very appropriate for today's, and—as you pointed out with your remarks on recruitment, sir—particularly for tomorrow's military services.

I read the testimony at the Iowa hearing held by Senator Jepsen. I think the need for a larger body of technically trained personnel was clearly established here. The desirability of the "Upfront GI Bill," where the military services—along with industry and the civil area—would benefit from the education, was also established. Although the magnitude of the cost savings seems to possibly be debatable, I think that it has been clearly shown that there will be some cost savings as a result of this act. So that Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act is a very good concept, and I certainly support it.

I think that yours is a difficult task, Senator Thurmond, for no one at these hearings lacks a vested interest in the outcome. The Iowa[1] hearing identified an anticipated resistance by the services to certain aspects of the bill. Comments were made concerning the "turf" and possible "empire" considerations.

And, correspondences from the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges referred to the "monolith" of the Department of Defense Education. And as you had pointed out, although recruitment for the military has been good over the past few years, it does look much poorer in the future due to the decrease in the size of the candidate pool and what may happen to the economy.

However, as you know, Senator, that's not a one-sided issue. Testimony in Iowa also showed that there were over 1,100 2-year schools which now do comprise the largest segment of American higher education. That system has been, I think, a very great benefit to the American people. But it does represent one of the fastest growing areas around. And it's an area that's affected by the same

[1] Cedar Rapids, IA, Dec. 16, 1983.

things as military recruitment. The decreased pool of high school graduates, which you addressed, coupled with a decrease in educational funding at the Federal and State levels in certain areas make this legislation extremely important to the continued growth of this large segment of higher education.

But I think that that's what makes this bill so attractive. Properly used, it may maintain or even improve the quality of military training while reducing the cost to the taxpayer. It should also provide both an increased student body and a badly needed infusion of Federal tax dollars into the 2-year system.

Now, although I am a strong supporter of the legislation, I do have several concerns about it:

First, the bill gives full responsibility to the service secretaries to establish the entering grade for members of the program. I think that's appropriate. But then the bill includes a parenthetical phrase, "(between pay grade E–3 and pay grade E–8)." That seems unnecessary and may cause problems that could be easily avoided by eliminating the phrase.

My second concern is that it needs to be very clearly understood that quality control of the program rests with the user—the military services. Although the bill seems to be very clear on this point with responsibility given to the secretaries, the testimony in Iowa introduced such concerns as "the academic integrity of the community college curriculum" and whether the services or the community college faculty are best qualified to determine the scope of education required. These are fundamental issues in higher education today—academic freedom and the role of the faculty in curriculum design. I think there will be some serious conflicts in this area, but I also believe they can be resolved.

My third concern also relates to faculty control, and I guess is based on a personal experience. I was a graduate student at a prestigious eastern university during the early phases of the Vietnam conflict. I witnessed both the Air Force and the Navy ROTC thrown off the campus by faculty action. If we undertake this large scale use of civilian higher education for technical training, there must be some very definite guarantee that it will be there when it's needed. It definitely must work during the period of limited hostilities—whether the conflict happens to be a popular one or not in the eyes of the faculty.

My last concern, I guess, is related to the same area. No one knows better than you, Senator Thurmond, that the purpose of the military is to deter war or to fight and win if the determination is made to do so by our Government. My understanding is that if we do go into a major future conflict, we will fight that war with people on active duty, in the Reserves, and in the Guard.

Time will probably not allow a major training effort that has been one of our strengths in the past. I presume that the size of our Active, Reserve and Guard forces are based on our combat needs. If those needs do not include as replacements military personnel in the training cadre, then I have no concern.

If, on the other hand, personnel performing training duties must be available to meet the initial replacement requirements, then the cost savings figures that assume their deletion must be viewed with caution. Although many analogies occur between industry and the

military, it must be remembered that their missions are different. Peacetime training and education have many similarities, but the replacement problem of attrition in combat is uniquely military.

Senator Thurmond, as I said at the beginning, I'm a very strong supporter of this bill. I think that the military should benefit from quality technical education at a somewhat reduced cost. The 2-year college system should benefit by the availability of additional tax dollars. Such a combination that benefits both of those areas should mean that the maximum benefit will really belong to the people—to our Nation.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my views, sir.

Senator THURMOND. It's a pleasure to have you here. I recall you made a very fine record in the Air Force, and we're very pleased to see you here as the president of this technical college.

Dr. ORTH. Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Orth follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY WILLIAM A. ORTH, PRESIDENT, TRIDENT TECHNICAL COLLEGE, CHARLESTON, SC

Senator Thurmond, before I begin my testimony, I would like to take a brief minute to welcome you to Trident Technical College and to thank you for choosing this site to hold the hearing on this extremely important bill. It is certainly appropriate for the hearing to be held on the campus of a two year college, and even more so because of the proximity of several major military installations. It's good to have you back home in South Carolina, Sir.

I believe the basic premise of senate bill 801 is excellent. Technical training in appropriate skills in return for a commitment for enlisted service in the Armed Forces in a concept appropriate for today's—and tomorrows—military services.

I read the testimony at the Iowa hearing held by Senator Jepsen. The need for a larger body of technically trained personnel was clearly established there. The desirability of an "Up Front GI Bill" where the military services—along with industry—would benefit from the education was also established. Although the magnitude of the cost savings may be in question, there clearly would be some savings in the direct costs of technical training. The Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act is a good concept, and I support it.

Yours is a difficult task, Senator Thurmond, for no one at these hearings lacks a vested interest in the outcome. The Iowa hearing identified anticipated resistance by the services to certain aspects of this bill. Comments were made concerning turf and empire considerations. Correspondence from the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) referred to the "monolith" of Department of Defense education. Although recruitment for the military is currently good, data on the decreasing number of high school graduates combined with positive predictions of the job market seem to indicate future problems. In the Washington hearings, these vested interests will need to be considered.

However, Senator, it's not a one-sided issue. I was somewhat surprised to see AACJC use the term "monolith" of education. Testimony in Iowa has shown there are over 1,100 two-year schools, comprising the "largest segment of American Higher Education." That system has been a great benefit to the American people, but it does represent one of the fastest growing "empires" around. In addition, it is an area that is dramatically affected by the same issues as military recruitment. Decreased pools of high school graduates, coupled with decreases in educational funding at the Federal and State level in many areas, make this legislation extremely important to the continued growth of this large segment of higher education.

That's what makes the concept of this bill so attractive. Properly used, it may maintain, or even improve, the quality of military training while reducing the cost to the taxpayer. It should also provide both an increased student body and a badly needed infusion of Federal tax dollars into the two-year college system.

Now, although I am a strong supporter of this legislation, I do have several concerns regarding its implementation.

First, the bill gives full responsibility to the Service Secretaries to establish the entering grade for members of the program. That's appropriate. But then the bill

39-188 O - 84 - 2

includes a parenthetical phrase—(Between pay grade E-3 and pay grade E-8). That seems unnecessary, and may cause problems that could easily be avoided by eliminating the phrase.

My second concern is that it needs to be clearly understood that quality control of the program totally rests with the user—the military services. Although the bill seems to be clear on this point, with responsibility given to the secretaries, the testimony in Iowa introduced such concerns as "the academic integrity of the community college curriculum", and whether the services, or the community college faculty, are best able to determine the level and scope of education required. These are fundamental issues in higher education today—academic freedom, and the role of the faculty in both curriculum design and institutional governance. There will be serious conflicts in this area. They can be resolved, but it is necessary to be aware of their existence before the fact.

My third concern is also related to faculty control, and is based on a personal experience. I was a graduate student at a prestigious eastern university during the early phase of the Vietnam conflict. I witnessed both the Air Force and Navy ROTC thrown off the campus by faculty action. If we undertake a large scale use of civilian higher education for technical training, there must be a guarantee that it will be there when it is a needed. It definitely must work during a period of limited hostilities—whether the conflict happens to be a popular one or not in the eyes of the faculty.

My last concern is related to the same area. No one knows better than you, Senator Thurmond that the purpose of the military is to deter war, or to fight and win if that determination is made by our government. My understanding is that if we are forced into a major future conflict, we will fight that war with people on active duty, in the reserve, or in the guard. Time will not allow a major training effort that has been one of our strengths in the past. I presume the size of our active, reserve, and guard forces are based on our combat needs. If those needs do *not* include, as immediate replacements, military personnel in the training cadre, then I have no concern. If, on the other hand, personnel performing training duties must be available to meet initial replacement requirements, then cost saving figures that assume their deletion must be viewed with caution. Although many analogies are valid between industry and the military, it must be remembered that their missions are very different. Peacetime training and education have many similarities, but the replacement problem of attrition in combat remains uniquely military.

Senator Thurmond, as I said at the beginning, I'm a supporter of the concept of this bill. The military should benefit from quality technical training at a somewhat reduced cost. The two-year college system should benefit by the availability of additional Federal tax dollars. And such a combination should mean that the maximum benefit will belong to the people—our Nation.

Thank you for the opportunity to share these thoughts today.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Martin, we would be pleased to hear from you next.

STATEMENT OF MONTEZ MARTIN, GOVERNING BOARD OF TRIDENT TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Mr. MARTIN. Thank you, Senator Thurmond. I am honored this morning for the privilege of appearing before you and the members of this subcommittee. I am also pleased that you have chosen to conduct this hearing in Charleston and on the campus of Trident Technical College.

This morning, I am preparing in my capacity as a member of the area commission, the governing body of Trident Technical College; as an ROTC graduate and a veteran of 21 years in the U.S. Army Reserve, 7 of which were spent on active duty. I am also here as an interested citizen of the State of South Carolina.

I will be very brief this morning, since there are others who are much more knowledgeable about the finer details of this legislation, the budget and associated data. Having read the legislation and some of the testimony given at the hearing on this bill last December in Cedar Rapids, IA, it is my sincere belief that S. 801 is

good legislation. I believe that it will permit the armed services to take advantage of the excellent educational facilities of our civilian communities. It is also my opinion that this is an excellent education opportunity to reuse tax dollars and perhaps even to save a few.

The technical and junior colleges of this Nation are already geared up to meet the training needs of a very fluid civilian job market. Therefore, this new mission to provide technical training to a select group of enlisted reserve personnel, thereby providing the armed services with a pool of skilled enlisted people, is well within the mission and capability of our colleges. It is a task that we can look forward to with great anticipation.

There are two points about the bill that gives me some concern. I respectfully suggest some attention be given to the following:

The specific reference in paragraph 2152(b)(3) that directs that, "the member shall be placed in an enlisted pay grade (between pay grade E–3 and E–8) * * *." It is my belief that this specific reference to the upper limits in pay grade E–8 should be deleted. This would remove the normal human desire to see a person entered in as high a ranking position as possible. Rather, I believe we should leave this to the discretion of each secretary of the armed services, thus allowing the services to seek their natural entrance level.

The second, that no restrictions or artificial pressure, internal or external, be placed on this program which might endanger the quality of the training. The quality must remain at the highest level possible if the Armed Forces are to receive the maximum benefit of the bill. I am sure you will agree that nothing should be done which might endanger the quality of the training.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, I believe that the national and military interests are served well under the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act; that we can raise the quality of our technically trained enlisted personnel in the process and also eliminate existing shortages. Finally, because we are recycling tax dollars, we can realize a significant cost savings.

It has been my pleasure to testify before you this morning. I thank you again for the opportunity and welcome you to Trident Technical College.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Martin follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY MONTEZ MARTIN, AREA COMMISSION MEMBER, TRIDENT TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Senator Thurmond: I am honored for the privilege of appearing before you and the members of this subcommittee. I am also pleased that you have chosen to conduct this hearing in Charleston and on the campus of Trident Technical College.

This morning I am appearing in my capacity as a member of the Area Commission, the governing body of Trident Technical College; as an ROTC graduate and a veteran of 21 years in the U.S. Army Reserves, of which seven (7) were spent on active duty. I am also here as a very interested citizen of South Carolina.

I will be very brief this morning, since there are others who are much more knowledgeable about the finer details of the legislation, the budget and associated data.

Having read the legislation and some of the testimony given at the hearing held on this bill last December in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, it is my sincere belief that S. 801 is good legislation. I believe that it will permit the Armed Services to take advantage of the excellent educational facilities of our civilian communities. It is also my opinion that this is an excellent educational opportunity to reuse tax dollars and perhaps even save a few of those dollars.

The technical and junior colleges of the Nation are already geared up to meet the training needs of a very fluid civilian job market. Therefore, this new mission to provide the technical training to a select group of enlisted reserves, thereby providing the armed services with a pool of skilled enlisted personnel, is well within the mission and capability of our colleges. It is a task that we can look forward to with great anticipation.

There are two points about the bill that give me some concern. I respectfully suggest that some attention be given to the following:

1. The specific reference in Paragraph 2152 (b)(3) that directs that, "the member shall be placed in an enlisted pay grade (between pay grade E-3 and pay grade E-8) . . ." It is my belief that the specific reference to the upper limit pay grade E-8, should be deleted. This would remove the normal human desire to see a person entered in as high a ranking position as possible. Rather, I believe we should leave this to the discretion of each Secretary of the armed services, thus allowing the services to seek their natural entrance level.

2. That no restrictions or artificial pressure, internal or external, be placed on this program which might endanger the quality of the training. The quality must remain at the highest level possible if the Armed Forces are to receive the maximum benefits of the bill. I am sure you will agree that nothing should be done which might endanger the quality of the training.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, I believe that the national and military interest are served very well under the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act; that we can raise the quality of our technically trained enlisted personnel and in the process, eliminate existing shortages. Finally, because we are recycling tax dollars, we can realize a significant cost savings.

It has been my pleasure to have testified before you this morning. Thank you again for this wonderful opportunity and welcome to Trident Technical College.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you very much. We are very pleased to have your views on this subject. Dr. LeCroy, we would be very pleased to hear from you.

Dr. LeCroy, as I stated, is chancellor of the Dallas County Community College.

STATEMENT OF DR. R. JAN LeCROY, CHANCELLOR, DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE, DALLAS, TX

Dr. LECROY. Mr. Chairman, you might be interested to know that the Dallas Community College District is the sixth largest community college district in the Nation. We enroll 100,000 credit students each year and about 70,000 noncredit students, half of whom are in technical occupational programs.

I would like to share with you another coincidence that I'm experiencing today. I'm a West Point graduate. And when I was teaching troops, I experienced quite a joy and satisfaction and thought about some day I might retire and become an educator.

I thought about that so much that I went ahead and left the service and moved into education and now chancellor. It's interesting that my West Point classmate stayed in and reached general officer status and then became an educator. I'm proud to be united with him after 30 years.

Senator THURMOND. Well, he'll get a little bigger retirement from the Government than you will. [Laughter.]

Dr. LECROY. That's correct.

Senator THURMOND. I'm pleased to have you here. And I'm so glad to see the graduates of our service academies going into the fields of service, especially teaching and operating schools and doing administrative work with schools. The military training, from my experience—I had 36 years in the Reserves, 4 years during World War II—is unexcelled for teaching people how to in-

struct, for teaching people management, for teaching people how to carry on their administrative work in an efficient manner.

And I'm very pleased that you gentlemen have entered this field.

Dr. LECROY. Thank you, sir.

Senator THURMOND. What is the largest, incidentally, technical college in the United States? You say you have 100,000?

Dr. LECROY. Per year. That's counting both semesters and the summer. The Los Angeles——

Senator THURMOND. That's a large city of people, 100,000.

Dr. LECROY. Yes, it is, sir.

Senator THURMOND. What is the largest?

Dr. LECROY. I believe it's the Los Angeles District. In fact, I'm certain it is; but I do not know their enrollment.

Senator THURMOND. At one institution?

Dr. LECROY. No; in my district, there are seven colleges; and the Los Angeles district, there are nine colleges in the same district. Under one administration in each case.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you very much.

Dr. LECROY. I am not here as General Orth's classmate, but rather as representing the American Association of Community & Junior Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees as the vice chairman of their joint commission on Federal relations.

I would like to recognize another member of that commission, who is here in moral support of me, and that is George Fields, Jr., president of Spartanburg Methodist College, SC.

Senator THURMOND. If you'll stand up. We're very pleased to have you with us.

Mr. FIELDS. Thank you.

Dr. LECROY. The joint commission has been strongly supportive of the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act since its origin. And we refer to this as SERTA.

There are many compelling reasons, Mr. Chairman, why SERTA should be made into the law. There are three which I wish to highlight.

The first is the predicted trained technician gaps in the military, the defense industry, and the general economy. Both the Army and the Navy are increasing their required technician manpower.

For example, the Navy estimates its demand for technical ratings by 1989 will grow by 30 percent.

The Army intends to reduce its infantry by 2,000, while increasing its technicians by 8,000.

The Air Force projects that its Active Force over the next 5 years will increase by 91,000, many of whom will require technical specialization to conduct Air Force business.

An even greater skill shortage is expected in the Reserve Forces. This is especially crucial if the Reserve Forces should be mobilized for active duty without being adequately trained.

With the economic growth in the high technology industry, many of the most talented and capable in the pool of technicians may be recruited by the private sector, thus leaving the military forces with fewer well-trained technicians. This possible shortage of trained technicians can be offset by a proactive quality training program as prescribed by SERTA.

The point I'm driving at here, Mr. Chairman, is that both the Active and Reserve Forces are currently experiencing severe skilled manpower shortages. Given the directions the forces are taking toward even higher technology applications and the decline in the military age group, the shortages will become even worse in the immediate and the long run.

My second point is the cost effectiveness and productivity which can be gained through the passage of SERTA. While an exact estimate of cost incurred by the military in the recruiting, training, and preparation of service men to perform their jobs is difficult to pinpoint, one expert indicates a figure of $189,000 per individual over a 3½-year period. The same expert states that enlisting a trained technician from one of the Nation's community, technical, or junior colleges, under the provisions of SERTA, can significantly reduce these costs.

As you may know, Mr. Chairman, the average cost of a 2-year degree program in a community or junior college, including tuition and related expenses is around $2,500 to $3,000. The productivity factor under this 2-year educational program would be far greater.

In addition, the recruit would be at least as well trained and as capable as those that graduate from the military schools.

My final point is that we have in this country an exceedingly capable, experienced, high quality, and interested technical education system with components of it existing in nearly every congressional district and reasonable close to most military installations. We have a system that operates on a philosophy that is both responsive to local educational needs and sensitive to national needs. This system of institutions exhibits an adaptability to alter programming to match shifts in demand, and it has a long history of cooperative partnership with local businesses, industry, and the public sector. The system has a tradition of service.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you this morning. It's a pleasure to share with you the commitment of America's community, technical, and junior colleges in contributing their resources to the Nation's effort to reestablish preeminence in the rapidly advancing international arena.

For these reasons and more, the joint commission is solidly behind the legislation. The handout which I have made available further elaborates on the points which I have highlighted.

Senator THURMOND. I don't know whether you've had the opportunity to discuss with Chairman Tower this particular legislation or not. Have you? John Tower. He's chairman of the Armed Services Committee?

Dr. LECROY. His legislation? His situation?

Senator THURMOND. This legislation.

Dr. LECROY. I have not discussed it with Senator Tower.

Senator THURMOND. Senator Tower is from Texas and chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I just wondered if you've had an opportunity to discuss this with him.

Dr. LECROY. I will walk over across town to SMU University and visit with him on that topic, sir.

Senator THURMOND. I think it would be very helpful if you did, because he's chairman of the full committee.

Dr. LECROY. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. LeCroy follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY DR. R. JAN LECROY, CHANCELLOR, DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, DALLAS, TX

Mr. Chairman, my name is Jan LeCroy. I am chancellor of the Dallas County Community College District, a system of eight community colleges serving the Dallas metropolitan area that in the fall of last year enrolled 60,000 fulltime and parttime students. Today I am representing the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees (AACJC-ACCT) as Vice Chairman of their Joint Commission on Federal Relations. The Joint Commission has been strongly supportive of the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act since its origin. We believe in this bill. We feel that it carries with it significant benefits for the Nation as a whole, for the military services—both active and reserve, for the defense industry, for local communities, and for the students and the higher education institutions who will train them under the bill's provisions.

There are many compelling reasons why SERTA should be made into law, Mr. Chairman. I have outlined a few of them below.

1. Filling skills gaps in the military, defense industry, and in the general economy.—The Army and Navy have embarked on an intensive capacity building program that will increase the number of men in an Army division of 23,000 (from 17,000 currently) and will expand the Navy fleet to 600 ships (from 515 ships now on active duty and 110 more under construction or contract). In the Army effort, the number of infantry will be reduced by approximately 2,000 and the number of skilled technicians will increase by about 8,000 men. Even now, the Navy does not have significant skilled manpower to operate its ships. According to one Navy expert (Warwood, 1983) by 1989 the service's demand for technical ratings is likely to grow by 30 percent and the "Navy will be facing major problems of simply meeting its manpower goals." The shortages will be exacerbated exponentially with the addition of 85 or more new ships.

Further, the Air Force projects that its active force (currently 593,000 persons) will increase by 91,000 people in the next five years, many of whom will have to have technical specialities to conduct the service's business. For example, the Air Force is deploying cruise missiles, but it does not have adequate transportation specialists nor mechanics to shuttle the missiles among the various sites. And, if the country deploys 1,000 "Midgetman" missiles, small enough to haul around on trucks, the Air Force would need an additional 50,000 mostly skilled technicians to conduct the effort.

Many experts believe that the skill shortage program is even more serious in the reserve forces. Some of your own colleagues, Mr. Chairman—(Rep. Les Aspin, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Personnel and Compensation, for one), believe that the reserve forces are not adequately trained nor ready for active services should they have to be mobilized.

The Defense Economic Impact Modeling System projects that the civilian industrial base will generate annually a demanded growth rate of about 15 percent in skilled manpower needs. This growth rate is important for a number of reasons, but one of the more important ones is the private sector is likely to draw-off/attract the most talented and capable of the available pool of manpower, thus leaving the military forces with the remainder from which to choose. The competition for the most capable individuals will be intensified, particularly because the age cohort is smaller now than it has been in the recent past and because the improved economy has opened up more opportunities in the private sector. Military duty will not be nearly so attractive to young, capable persons as it was during the recent economic downturns the U.S. has experienced. A few years ago, the Atlantic Council of the United States reported on an issue related to this point. The Council stated in a June 1982 monograph that "The quality of Army recruits in recent years, as measured by test scores and the possession of high school diploma . . . has often fallen below that of the draft years, and even the early years of the volunteer force . . . Higher quality becomes even more essential with the growing sophistication of weaponry."

The point I am driving at here, Mr. Chairman, is that both the active and reserve forces are currently experiencing severe skilled manpower shortages and that, given the directions the forces are taking toward even higher technology applications and the decline in population of military age, the shortages will become even worse in the immediate and longer term. SERTA offers an attractive, existing, and responsive means of alleviating at least some of the curse of these shortages by opening up a resource of skilled manpower generally untapped at the present time. It is a resource that can be shaped to meet the specific needs of the military services; it is

one that can attract the best and brightest of our technically interested young population; it is one that has tested, high quality instructional programs in place; it is one that is experienced in working with military installations, military personnel, and/or defense-related business and industry in local communities; and it is one that can give the military a steady flow (a flow that can be controlled to match the demand) of skilled technicians in a very cost-attractive mode.

This bill opens the great capacity of the community, technical, and junior colleges in this country to the secretaries of the military services. It permits the secretaries to select students with particular technical skills for participation in what has been termed an "upfront GI bill" program. In this way, the secretaries enlist proven technicians, in the numbers they desire, to fill shortages that exist or are expected to exist, at a cost that is far below what it would take the services themselves to produce similarly educated and trained individuals.

The additional point I want to make here is that not only is such a program important for addressing the skill shortages of the active and reserve forces but also it contributes to increasing the technical skill level of the civilian population serving national security, since participants have the option of reserve duty and, once they have completed their military obligations, they would be available to local business and industry, including whatever defense industries that demand the same skills.

2. Costs and productivity.—It is difficult for a variety of reasons to verify the exact costs associated with educational and training expenses incurred by the military forces in recruiting and preparing servicemen to perform their jobs. But we have been told by one expert, Walter Muller, that the average cost of simply recruiting an individual for one of the services is approximaely $39,000. Mr. Muller also suggests that, depending on the technical speciality, it can take as many as three and a half years to train an individual and as much as $150,000 per individual—all for a four-year enlistee who may decide to leave the active service before the military can begin to gain a fair return on its investment. According to Muller, enlisting a trained technician from one of the Nation's community, technical, or junior colleges under the provisions of SERTA can significantly reduce these costs. He has indicated that in one demonstration program involving satellite communications technicians, recruits with training in electronics communications, hydraulics, and/or physics were assigned to be trained for work on a special missile system. The demonstration was conducted at the Redstone military Arsenal. The result was: (1) the attrition rate was reduced from 50 percent under standard procedures to zero; (2) the time rate runs from two years to 42 weeks; and (3) the communciations training period was cut from 57 weeks to 17 weeks. This represents a significant cut in expenditures and, equally important, a significant increase in the amount of productive time each recruit spends at his/her MOS.

As you may know, Mr. Chairman, the average cost of a two-year degree program in our public community, technical, and junior colleges including books, tuition, required fees, and related expenses, runs approximately $2,500 to $3,000. The costs of training technicians totally through military schools is many more times this figure, particularly the higher technology skills. Further, the pay back time a recruit would contribute to the service under this program (the productivity factor) would be far greater than were the recruit to have progressed through the traditional military system. And the recruit would be at least as well trained and at least as capable as those that graduate from the military schools.

3. My final point, Mr. Chairman, is that we have in this country an exceedingly capable, exerienced, high-quality, and interested technical education system, with components of it existing in nearly every congressional district and reasonably close to most military installations. We have a system that operates on a philosophy that is both responsive to local education needs and sensitive to national needs. The system of institutions exhibits an adaptability to alter programming to match shifts in demand, and it has a long history of cooperative partnerships with local business, industry, and the public sector. The system has a tradition of service.

One of the benefits of SERTA is that the secretaries of the services can tap into this rich resource when there is a need. They do not have to invest in long-term capital expenditures, in long-term personnel assignments (thus reducing the on-line skill capacities of personnel), nor in training excessive numbers of recruits to ensure an adequate supply. They can use the system when they need it to develop the personnel they want and at a cost that is far below what they would have to budget were they to train in-house.

For these reasons and more, Mr. Chairman, the Joint Commission is solidly behind this legislation. I would be happy to respond to any questions you might have.

As a West Point graduate, I especially appreciate the opportunity to testify before this important panel this morning and for the opportunity to share with you the commitment of America's community, technical, and junior colleges to contribute its resources to the Nation's effort to reestablish its preeminence in the world community.

Senator THURMOND. I'm the ranking member on the committee. Thank you very much. We're pleased to have you with us Dr. LeCroy, and I'm sure your recommendation will be helpful.

Dr. Darrow, we're pleased to hear from you. Dr. Darrow, I believe you're a retired Air Force colonel, too, aren't you?

Dr. DARROW. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. We're very pleased to have you here.

STATEMENT OF DR. LYLE E. DARROW, VICE CHANCELLOR, ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Dr. DARROW. Thank you, Senator Thurmond. I want to thank you for the opportunity to present my views on the need for the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act.

In my testimony, I will attempt not to repeat material presented by others appearing before you but rather to relate what I feel is pertinent to my areas of expertise and experience. I did have the privilege of spending over 27 years on active duty in the Air force, both as an enlisted person and as a commissioned officer. In my enlisted days, I had the privilege of undergoing technical training in the Air Force.

I later taught technical training, worked closely with technical training graduates, both as a pilot and a commander of installations in Germany, Norway, and England and have been heavily involved in Air Force technical training in my prior capacity as president of the Community College of the Air Force.

I've been involved in the administration of both junior and senior ROTC programs. And I currently oversee the operation of forty-three 2-year colleges.

As a former single engine fighter pilot whose life depended on the quality of maintenance, I am in support of this act, because I'm convinced that civilian technical training is as good as that conducted by the military.

As you are already well aware, the several services have been relatively successful in meeting recruiting quotas during the recent past, and you've already mentioned the forecast and the decrease in the number of high school graduates. The services must implement realistic alternative programs to entice young people into their ranks.

Senate bill 801 will provide an excellent method to accomplish that. Now, this bill will also close a gap that we have in our educational process as it relates to military association.

We have, as we all know, an ROTC program in several hundred colleges and universities throughout the country. We also have a junior ROTC Program in many hundreds of high schools throughout this Nation. These offer viable programs to many thousands of young people. This program will bridge that gap by providing a military associated program for the junior, community, and technical colleges throughout the Nation.

39-188 O - 84 - 3

Now, all of the reasons that made both the junior ROTC and the senior ROTC Programs a success, apply equally to the 2-year college ROTC Program that the SERTA bill would produce. Now, there is among the several services a well-documented need for technical training. That's established. Some of this training is job specific and requires training with equipment used exclusively by the military. Training with such equipment can be best done by the military.

But the vast majority of technical training done by the military is a duplication of that offered by the Nation's 1,200-plus community colleges. It's important to note that such training can be accomplished by civilian institutions at much lower cost, especially when one considers the true cost of technical training done by the military.

I'm sure that the various services have or at least will furnish you figures regarding the cost of technical training. I am also just as sure that these costs will not reflect the true cost of such training. A true cost of training can be estimated by taking the annual costs of operating an entire training installation and subtracting the actual cost of any activity not directly involved in the training.

Keesler Air Force Base in Mississippi is a typical example. It is an installation that is almost exclusively devoted to technical education. Keesler has the expense of a hospital, a motor pool, an accounting and finance activity, fire departments, security police, legal, commissary, enlisted clubs, officers' clubs, dormitories, cafeterias, bowling lanes, movie theaters, et cetera, et cetera, all of which are part of the true cost of operating that installation for training.

Figures recently provided me indicate that the annual cost for the operation of Keesler Air Force Base is approximately $276 million, and they provide training for approximately 15,000 students in a given year. This is approximately $18,400 per student. Referencing back to the figures that were quoted earlier of 3,000 to 4,000, even with new math, that's quite a difference.

Now, this $276 million, I found out, does not include student pay, so we needed to add another approximately $600 per month per student to that $276 million. So much for a brief look at the cost of training. Let me now look at opportunities of such training to be done by civilian institutions.

Following a period of negotiation in 1979, the Community College of Lake County, IL, entered into a contractual agreement to provide instructional programs for Navy recruits. Currently, this community college is providing instruction in propulsion engineering, basic electricity and electronics, fire control technician, advanced electronic technician, electrician's mate, interior communication, diesel mechanic, structure training and gunner's mate training.

Primarily, as a result of this positive experience between the community college and the Navy, the college is also entertaining contracts with the Army and two more contracts with the Navy. What's interesting to note is there have been 30,000 products of this training since 1979 who have entered active duty and reserves with the Navy, and the competency and the quality has been equal to or exceeded that as when the Navy provided this training.

Some other interesting information is that in the 4 years that the Lake County Community College was doing the training for the Navy at Great Lakes, their attrition rate—their washout rate—was 12 percent. The Navy's attrition rate for the same training when they conducted it was 22 percent.

I maintained that the 2-year institutions in this country can provide technical training for the majority of the specialists' needs in the Armed Forces. All the basic skills used by the military in the various trades—carpentry, sheet metal, welding, plumbing, electrical, automotive mechanics, et cetera—are skills directly transferable to the needs of the military.

Other military skill areas—electronics, computer science, paraprofessional medical—have as their core or foundation the same skills taught by the civilian institutions. For example, an Army, Navy, or Air Force avionics technicians start their training with basic courses in electricity and electronics.

In addition the services employ many thousands in allied or service-oriented fields such as dental assistant, radiologist, administration, budget, finance, accounting, supply, basic office skills. This training is usually a direct duplication of training available in civilian institutions. Certainly, I feel little valid argument can be raised against allowing civilian institutions to provide this kind of training.

In addition to providing technical training at a significantly lower cost and in civilian institutions that will bolster our democratic citizen-soldier concept, there is a real bonus that many people seem to overlook. In addition to the technical courses that will provide the knowledge and skills performed in the military's specific tasks, the S. 801, the service student will also be taking courses in science, communication, English, math, physics, management, and other general education courses as part of their curriculum.

Courses such as these are of immeasurable value, as these young people will soon become the supervisors and later noncommissioned officers who will provide the leadership. They will become managers, counselors, writers, planners, public speakers, and communicators.

Now, this need for a general education component for training is accurately reflected in a passage written by General Bennie Davis, Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command. And I quote:

> Our enlisted force must be prepared for the demanding responsibilities in a changing technological Air Force. The community college offers this preparation through job-relevant, academically sound educational programs which develop the person and the professional skills necessary to meet the demands of an increasing complex mission.

I think it's interesting to add that when General Davis issued this quote, he at that time, was Commander of the Air Training Command, which provides all the technical training for the Air Force.

Various people within the several services have offered objections to Senate bill S. 801. Many of these objections appear on the surface to have merit. However, each has some degree of fallacy and should not be accepted at face value. I have listed some such objections as an attachment to my testimony, which you have. For

the sake of brevity, I have not provided comments regarding them but would be pleased to discuss them with you or a member of your committee staff.

Senator Thurmond, thank you for the opportunity to share my concerns with you today on a bill that I most strongly support.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Darrow follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY DR. LYLE E. DARROW, VICE CHANCELLOR, ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Senator Thurmond, I want to thank you for the opportunity to present my views on the need for the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act. Although I will share some of my thoughts on Senate bill No. 801 with you today, I feel that my main contribution would be in responding to material the various services will present to you in support of their objections to the bill.

In my testimony, I will attempt not to repeat material presented by others appearing before you, but rather to relate what I feel is pertinent to my areas of expertise and experience. I had the privilege of spending over 27 years of active duty in the Air Force as an enlisted person and as a commissioned officer. I have undergone technical training, taught technical training, worked closely with technical training graduates both as a pilot and as a commander of installations in Germany, Norway, and England and have been heavily involved in Air Force technical training in my prior capacity as president of the Community College of the Air Force. I have been involved in the administration of both junior and senior ROTC programs. I currently oversee the operation of 43 two-year colleges, a bachelor's degree-granting institution, and the Alabama Industrial Development Training Institute which provides state-of-the-art training to industry throughout Alabama.

As you are well aware, the several services have been relatively successful in meeting recruitment quotas during the recent past. However, with the forecast decrease in number of high school graduates and improvement of our Nation's economy the favorable recruiting environment will be diminishing. The services must implement realistic alternative programs to entice young people into their ranks. Senate bill No. 801 will provide an excellent method to accomplish that. This bill would also fill the gap between junior ROTC (for high school students) and senior ROTC (four four-year college students) by offering a viable program for the many thousands of young people in the junior, community, and technical colleges throughout the Nation. All of the reasons that have made these two programs a success apply equally as well to a future "two-year college ROTC program."

There is, among the several services a well-documented need for technical training. Some of this training is job specific, and requires training with equipment used exclusively by the military. Training with such equipment can perhaps be done best by the military, but the vast majority of technical training done by the military is duplicative of that offered by the Nation's 1,200-plus two-year colleges. It is important to note that such training can be accomplished by civilian institutions at a much lower cost, especially when one considers the true cost of technical training done by the military. I'm sure the various services will furnish you figures regarding the cost of technical training. I am also sure that these costs will not reflect the true cost of such training. A true cost can be estimated by taking the annual total costs of operating an entire installation and subtracting the actual cost of any activity not directly involved in technical training. Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, is a typical example, it being an installation that is almost exclusively devoted to technical education. Keesler has the expense of a hospital, motor pool, accounting and finance activity, fire departments, security police department, legal department, commissary, enlisted and officers' clubs, dormitories, cafeterias, bowling lanes, movie theaters, etc.—all of which are part of the true cost of technical training. Figures recently provided me indicate the annual cost for operation of Keesler is approximately $276,000,000 and they provide training for approximately 15,000 students in a given year. This is a raw cost of $18,400 per student, a very expensive cost for training (if the $276,000,000 does not include student pay, add $600 per student per month). So much for a brief look at the cost of training, let's now look at the opportunities of such training being done by civilian institutions.

I maintain that the two-year institutions in this country can provide technical training for the majority of the specialists needed in the Armed Forces. All of the basic skills used by the military in various "trades" (carpentry, sheet metal, welding, plumbing, electrical, automotive mechanics, etc.) are skills directly transferable to the needs of the military. Other military skill areas (electronics, computer sci-

ence, para-professional medical, etc.) have as their core or foundation the same skills taught by the civilian institutions. For example, avionics technicians start their training with basic courses in electricity and electronics. In addition, the services employ many thousands in allied or service oriented fields, such as dental assistant, radiologist, administration, budget, finance, accounting, supply, basic office skills, etc. This training is usually a direct duplication of training available in civilian institutions. Certainly little valid argument can be raised against following civilian institutions to provide such training.

In addition to providing technical training at a significantly lower cost and in civilian institutions that will bolster our democratic citizen-soldier concept, there is a real bonus that many seem to overlook. In addition to technical courses, that will provide the knowledge needed to perform specific tasks in their military specialty, the S. 801 student will be taking science, communications, English, mathematics, physics, management and other general education courses. Courses such as these are of immeasurable value, as these young people will soon become supervisors and later, noncommissioned officers who will need to be effective managers, counselors, writers, planners, public speakers and communicators. This need is accurately reflected in a passage written by Gen. Bennie L. Davis, Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command: "our enlisted force must be prepared for the demanding responsibilities in a changing technological Air Force. The Community College of the Air Force offers this preparation through job-relevant, academically sound educational programs which develop the personal and professional skills necessary to meet the demands of an increasing complex mission."

Various people within the several services have offered objections to S. 801. Many of these objections appear on the surface to have merit, however, each has some degree of fallacy and should not be accepted at face value. I have listed such objections as an attachment to this testimony. For the sake of brevity I have not provided comments regarding them, but would be pleased to discuss them with you or a member of your committee staff.

Senator Thurmond, thank you for the opportunity to share my concerns with you today.

MILITARY OBJECTIONS TO SERTA

SERTA assumes a skilled specialist is synonymous with a trained specialist.

SERTA would place individual in a military leadership role without experience.

Large military training installations are necessary because of a high cost of equipment.

SERTA would shift military training burden from technical schools to on-the-job training.

Civilianizing training does not allow for surge capability during times of national emergencies.

It would be costly to establish the administrative structure necessary to implement such a program.

There would be higher personnel costs involved over the period of a career since the new recruit would be starting off at an elevated pay level.

There would be fewer promotions for the Senate bill 801 person to look forward to during a normal career; thus, incentive might lessen or a sense of stagnation might occur.

There could be some "friction" created between the Senate bill 801 person and the traditional service person who earned their promotion through normal career progression.

The Senate bill 801 person would not be able to go directly to work inasmuch as they would lack specific training on actual systems.

Many of the two-year institutions are not state-of-the-art in technical areas.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you very much, Dr. Darrow. We're very pleased to have you with us and thank you for your fine contribution.

Now, our next speaker is Dr. Garrison. Dr. Garrison, we're glad to have you with us.

STATEMENT OF DR. DON C. GARRISON, PRESIDENT, TRI-COUNTY TECHNICAL COLLEGE, PENDLETON, SC

Dr. GARRISON. Thank you, Senator Thurmond, for allowing me to join with my community technical colleagues from across the Nation and Dr. Orth right here in South Carolina and one of the members of our TEC college commission here in South Carolina to share thoughts and perspectives on S. 801. Certainly, you and members of the Senate Armed Services Committee have a monumental task because the decisions you make and the recommendations you make to the U.S. Senate can have resounding impact on our Nation's future economy and certainly on the security of our country.

The economy and security of a leading free society on this globe send reverberations not only throughout this country but around the world. And I've had on numerous occasions, Senator Thurmond, as you well know, the opportunity to provide testimony to congressional committees.

On all occasions, my testimony has been related to legislation for education, and, as you know also, many have questioned the Federal involvement in education. But our subject today is not debatable because national defense is a constitutionally mandated Federal Government responsibility.

I'm, therefore, most pleased to be able to speak on behalf of a defense-related issue that relates directly to education. Unlike those who provided previous testimony here this morning, I am an American who has never spent the first day in the Armed Forces of our Nation. But at the same time, during my lifetime here in South Carolina, most all of it, I have enjoyed the many luxuries of freedom which our country continues to provide for all of its citizens, the joys and freedoms that many will agree today that we take for granted, although there are many throughout the world who would risk their lives to enjoy those same freedoms that we possibly take for granted.

So whatever contribution that I have to make to these hearings as an educator comes from that, a professional lifetime as an educator. And my service as an educator has provided many opportunities for me to pursue goals and objectives, not only in our own community and this State, but national goals as well.

Therefore, I speak this morning, Senator Thurmond, as the president of Tri-County Technical College here in South Carolina, in Pendleton and as the president also of the Aerospace Education Foundation of the Air Force Association. And I'm sure that you're aware that Senator Barry Goldwater, a member of your committee, is the chairman of the board of the Aerospace Education Foundation. And, indeed, I have spoken with Senator Goldwater and know him to support this measure.

I speak also as the cochairman of a Joint Task Force of the American Association of Community College Trustees. Dr. LeCroy serves, as has been noted also on a joint task force on legislation of these two major national associations. This task force that I speak of deals with a crucial national priority of putting and keeping Americans at work.

And finally, I come before this committee, before you, as a current member of the executive committee and past chairman of the

Council for Occupational Education of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Now, I've cited all this to make the point that I believe that I have a unique perspective to add to this series of hearings because each entity that I've referenced is cognizant of S. 801 and has endorsed its adoption. And I will touch on the different elements contributing to the creation of my perspective as I attempt to convey to you some of the more critical points which, without question, in my judgment, support the rationale for not only passage of this measure but for funding and full implementation of S. 801.

Now, the first point I will offer is one of historical significance and one that explains the origin and germination of the seed, if you please, of the basic concepts contained in the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act, S. 801.

In the summer of 1981, 4 years ago, I chaired that year the Council for Occupational Education of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, as I have referenced. And I convened that summer in Washington, DC, and, strangely enough, at the Air Force Association headquarters, this council to plan the program of work.

And one item on the agenda for that 3-day planning session was a presentation by an Air Force colonel stationed at the Pentagon. I don't remember that colonel's name and wouldn't dare cite it here today, but this colonel presented to the council the idea of a program between 2-year colleges and the military. The same basic concepts that were presented that day, you have now embodied in S. 801.

And as a result of that same presentation, another member of that council, Andy Korim of Allegheny Community College in Pittsburgh, went back home and later came to Pendleton; and in my office, the two of us hammered out a resolution that the Council for Occupational Education endorsed late, as did the AACJC and as did the Association of Community and Junior College Trustees.

So you see the point I'm making here, or attempting to make, is the fact that this seed or the basic idea of this program between the 2-year colleges—not all, but selected ones across America—and the military did not germinate with the educator. The seed is with the military.

And we picked it up because we thought it was a good idea, many of us, and have moved it forward. But I would suggest that 4 years has passed, and time has passed, and we really need to get on with the show with this legislation. It's also important that you know that the Air Force—and you've already alluded to this, Senator Thurmond—has endorsed this measure for 2 consecutive years.

I would like to cite from page 22 of the Air Force Association's policy paper under the heading "Policy of Defense Manpower Issues for 1984," the subheading, "The Magic Weapons," is the association's endorsement of legislation necessary to provide a Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Program.

Now, time does not permit me to elaborate on all the points in this policy paper. But it is best, I believe, to summarize by quoting a joint posture statement made by the Air Force Secretary, Verne Orr, and the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Charles Gabriel. And I

quote their statement: "Ultimately, our capability as an Air Force depends on our people. Recent combat has shown that well-trained, well-led, motivated people win battles. When a pilot resigns—and equally critical because this next part of this statement that I'm quoting relates directly to the fact of the manpower level we're talking about with SERTA—when a pilot resigns, when a crew chief hangs up his or her uniform, years of irreplaceable experience are lost. The best equipment that money can buy will not carry the day without the right people."

And I end that quote. Now, the Air Force obviously has recognized the importance of investing in human resources as being equal to the importance of investing billions of dollars for high-tech weapons systems. In the private sector, business and industrial leaders, corporate officials and boards have come to acknowledge, and indeed begun to maximize, the greatest resource of all that they possess, and that's people.

And they've also come to recognize, thanks to this task force that I referenced on putting and keeping Americans back at work, this same valuable resource as a tool to be used to retrain, upskill, and update their people.

SERTA, we believe, can be another step in the direction of maximizing America's greatest resource for the military, and that's its people. Another top-ranking consideration as you evaluate the logic and pressing need for S. 801 and its companion House bill, H.R. 1937, is one of national economic strength and vitality.

Now, quickly, the question may arise: How do these economic strengths that you speak of and this economic vitality relate to enhancing the needed supply of technicians for the Nation's military?

Our ability to continue to develop, operate, maintain, and enhance a strong national defense deterrent posture is directly, Senator, related to not only our will—and that may not be what it should be—but to our ability financially to purchase and support, as far as I'm concerned, the undebatable necessary defense systems that our world today mandates.

It has finally been recognized that to maintain economic strength and vitality, our Nation has to compete in the world marketplace. An essential to competing in the world marketplace today is that of increasing manufacturing and productivity, or productivity and manufacturing.

What we're competing with is 80 percent of the world's populations who reside in the Third World developing countries who work today at what we in America consider to be slave wage rates. This factor, compounded with the rapid degree that Japan and West Germany have embraced the so-called high tech, make our ability to compete in the world marketplace as a nation most formidable.

Now, the answer is not going to be achieved in the manufacturing community, nor, indeed, in the military in a defense posture without training that's at the state of the art. So our post-industrial, high-tech society of today demands the highest educational level for the mass population ever experienced by our Nation.

Thanks in part to the Keeping America At Work Task Force that I have referenced, these corporations across America have recognized this invaluable resource that 2-year colleges represent. Apparently, our Department of Defense has not yet fully recognized

this great national resource as you have recognized it, Senator Thurmond, in your introductory remarks over a year ago for S. 801.

And I thank you, Senator, for acknowledging the availability of this great national resource in your introductory remarks.

And I am confident that members of this subcommittee recognize—and the full committee recognizes—the problems and successes in meeting the recruiting and retention goals of our All Volunteer Forces. And I think many would suggest—I'm almost certain that my Air Force friends—I'm not sure about Dr. LeCroy—would believe that the Air Force may be representing the glamour service, and they're pretty high on the totem pole in terms of the other branches of the service.

However, they still have problems. And I'll quote from the current issue of Air Force Magazine, the July issue, Ben Catlin's article there, that makes this point:

> For the third consecutive year last year, the Air Force retention rates improved across the board. First-term reenlistment—and this is a part of the problem as we see it—first-term reenlistments were up 9 percent, and career reenlistments were up from 90 percent to 92.
>
> However, major shortages continue to exist in the noncommissioned supervisory grades of E–5 through E–7. Even though total manning is at authorized levels, the Air Force can expect to see a decline—I'm still quoting from this article—to see a decline in enlistment and reenlistment rates as the economy continues to recover and as competiton increases for a declining number of high school graduates in the private sector. Not necessarily competition for those high school graduates by 2-year colleges; but between the industry and the military, the competition is going to continue to increase, all reports indicate.

So the demand for higher skilled technicians poses a very formidable competitive force. Now, against the backdrop of that scenario that I've just painted and with your awareness that I am a community college zealot, you must logically be asking this question: What's in it for the educator? Are these 2-year college leadership people empire builders, in view of the fact that just a few short years ago they began enrolling more freshmen every year than did the 4-year colleges and universities?

And also you could probably amplify that question by adding to it the fact that of these freshman, more than 50 percent that went on to higher education, more than half of those were enrolled in occupationally specific programs, the very kind of specialties that we're talking about here and that you have addressed as a need for the military through SERTA. Not only in engineering technology, but in the allied health areas, computer sciences, and on and on the list goes.

So in response to that kind of question, what's in it for the 2-year college, I can only offer a very sincere, Senator, and a very direct answer. We believe that S. 801 is good for America. It's good for our economy. It's good for people. It's good for the military. It's simply good for the United States.

And if given a chance, the 2-year college can contribute to our military strength. And that's really what we want the military to do, to simply recognize the 2-year colleges as having an ability to contribute to their role and their mission that so many of us believe in so very strongly.

And it has come to the attention of many 2-year college leadership people that the Department of Defense perceives our support of SERTA as an effort to take over the training responsibilities of the military. And, Senator, I'll assure you that this is not the case, even though possibly some of the testimony provided in Iowa with Senator Jepsen's committee might lead the reader to believe otherwise. That's really not the heart of the interest.

It's just simply we believe we are a great resource to be used by the military and that they can take these technicians that we produce and with specialized training, use them and use them well.

Now, there are many points that I intended to address here. I've already used up most of my time, but I would like to summarize and just hit on four quickies. The programs of instruction about which we're speaking are already in place. We're not talking about a new initiative on the part of 2-year colleges.

Those programs, there is a plethora of programs in engineering technologies, allied health programs and so forth.

The entering rank question—I've done some personal informal research, primarily with Air Force airmen, and I've asked this question. I've presented the bill, and they all like it, they've endorsed it, but they do have a sincere question about the entering rank. I think maybe the range there from E–3 to E–8 is too high, and it probably should be E–4. That's a morale factor.

But I would say this—and I made this point at a breakfast meeting that General Dority, an executive director of the Air Force Association, convened on this measure a year ago this past spring—the ROTC program, Senator, as we know it today, that the military looks to as a basic supplier of its leadership people, probably wasn't accepted any more than SERTA would be accepted initially.

As human beings, we all resist change. Your measure contains accreditation criteria. I think I would like to strengthen it a little bit and put specific program accreditation where specialized accreditation exists. These programs I've already talked about are ongoing, and there's a provision in there to keep colleges from starting up programs just to be SERTA-administering institutions.

We're not talking about hampering or talking on the specialized training role of the military at all. There is a provision in there possibly for Federal money to purchase equipment and to purchase training systems. I don't think that's necessary, personally.

These programs are ongoing; they're quality; they're meeting the standards of business and industry; and I believe they can meet the standards and do meet the standards of the military. And, too, I think we'll be talking about some pilot programs.

Now, one summary statement here, and I'll conclude. And I thank you for your patience. One of the Founding Fathers of our Nation, who, by the way, advocated the 2-year college in his day as we know it today—and that's over 1,200—this person was Thomas Jefferson.

And this statement that he made still rings true today. And I cannot think of SERTA without thinking of the statement that Thomas Jefferson made, and I quote him. Thomas Jefferson said this: "A nation that expects to be ignorant and free expects what never was and never will be."

And I can't think of a SERTA bill and all the implications of that, and particularly the one of enhancing our ability to deter against those who would aggress our country, without thinking of that principle.

So I appreciate the honor you've presented me today, Senator Thurmond, for allowing me to share my thoughts on this measure and for your vision and foresight and leadership by introducing the proposal. And I would assure you that the Nation's 1,200 community-based colleges remain and will continue to be an immeasurable national resource.

And we sincerely hope that the Department of Defense and the Congress will clearly acknowledge and maximize this immeasurable resource represented by America's community technical colleges.

Thank you, Senator.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Garrison follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY DR. DON C. GARRISON, PRESIDENT, TRI-COUNTY TECHNICAL COLLEGE, PENDLETON, SC

Thank you, Senator Thurmond and members of this subcommittee, for allowing me to share some thoughts and perspectives on S. 801. You have a monumental task because the decisions you make and the recommendations you make to the United States Senate can have resounding impact on our Nation's future economy and security. The economy and security of the leading free society on this globe send reverberations not only throughout this country but around the world. Although your work on this committee in monumental, I believe that your recommendations will be in the best interests of our national economy and security.

I have had, on numerous occasions, the opportunity to provide testimony to congressional committees. On all occasions, my testimony has dealt with legislation relating to education. As you know, many have questioned federal involvement in education. Our subject today, however, is not debatable because national defense is a constitutionally mandated federal government responsibility. I am, therefore, most pleased to be able to speak on behalf of a defense-related issue that relates directly to education.

I speak today as an American who has never spent the first day in the Armed Forces of this Nation. At the same time, during my 50 years, I have enjoyed the many luxuries of freedom which our country continues to provide all of its citizens—joys and freedoms that many agree are taken for granted today, although many in the world would risk their lives to enjoy the freedoms that we take for granted.

The contribution which I have made to my country during my professional lifetime is that of an educator, first as a teacher and coach for 10 years, then as a manager and president of two-year colleges here in South Carolina. My service as an educator has provided many opportunities for me to pursue goals and objectives of local and State significance, as well as those of national and international scope. Therefore, I speak to you, Senator Thurmond and members of the committee, as the president of Tri-Country Technical College in Pendleton, South Carolina, and as the president of the Aerospace Education Foundation of the Air Force Association. (Senator Barry Goldwater, a member of your committee, is chairman of the board of the foundation). I speak also as co-chairman of a joint task force of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees. This task force deals with the crucial national priority of putting and keeping Americans at work. And, finally, I come before this committee as a current member of the executive committee and past chairman of the council for occupational education of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. I, therefore, believe that I bring a unique perspective to this series of hearings because each entity I have just referenced is cognizant of S. 801 and has endorsed its adoption.

I will touch on the different elements contributing to the creation of my perspective as I attempt to convey to you a number of most critical points which, without question, support the rationale for passage, funding and implementation of this excellent proposed legislative measure.

The first point that I offer is one of historical significance and one that explains the origin of the basic concepts contained in the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act, S. 801. In the summer of 1981, the year that I chaired the Council on Occupational Education, of AACJC, I convened the executive board of the council in Washington, DC, at the Air Force Association headquarters. One item on the agenda was a presentation by an Air Force colonel stationed at the Pentagon. I don't remember his name. This colonel presented, however, to the council the idea for a program between 2-year colleges and the military, the same basic concepts now embodied in S. 801. As a result of that presentation, another member of the council executive committee, Andy Korim of Allegheny Community College in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and I met, in my office several weeks later and drafted a proposal to the board of directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges to incorporate this proposal into its legislative program for the following year. Mr. Korim's Congressman, Representative Don Bailey, soon thereafter introduced the measure now known as SERTA in the House of Representatives. Shortly afterward, Senator Thurmond introduced the proposed measure in the Senate. So, you see, the idea for Serta did not originate with educators. It, indeed, originated with the airman at that COE board meeting in Washington.

It is also important that you know that the Air Force Association has endorsed the measure for two years. On page 22 of the Air Force Association's policy paper is the policy of "defense manpower issues for 1984" under the heading "the magic weapon" is the association's endorsement of legislation necessary to provide for a skilled enlisted reserve training program. Time does not permit me to elaborate on all of the points this policy paper contains in support of S. 801. It is best, I believe, to summarize by quoting a joint posture statement made by Air Force Secretary Verne Orr and Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Charles A. Gabriel. I quote their statement, "ultimately, our capability as an Air Force depends on our people. Recent combat has shown that well-trained, well-led, motivated people win battles. When a pilot resigns, when a crew chief hangs up his or her uniform, years of irreplaceable experience are lost. The best equipment that money can buy will not carry the day without the right people." End of quote.

The Air Force obviously has recognized the importance of investing in the human resource as being equal to the importance of investing billions of dollars for high-tech weapons systems. In the private sector, business and industrial leaders, corporate officials and boards have come to acknowledge the necessity of maximizing the greatest resource of all people. SERTA can be another step in the direction of maximizing America's greatest resource, its people.

Another top-ranking consideration as you evaluate the logic and pressing need for S. 801 and its companion House bill, H.R. 1937, is the one of national economic strength and vitality. The question which may arise immediately is, "how does economic strength and vitality relate to enhancing a needed supply of technicians for the Nation's military?" Our ability to continue to develop, operate, maintain and enhance a strong national defense/deterrent posture is directly related to our ability to purchase and financially support the undebatably necessary defense systems mandated by today's world.

It has finally been recognized that, to maintain economic strength and vitality, our Nation must be able to compete in the world marketplace. Essential to competing in the world market is the demand to constantly increase the productivity in manufacturing.

Eighty percent of the world's people are living and working at what we Americans would consider slave wages. This factor, compounded by the advanced technology at the workplaces in Japan and west Germany, present a real challenge to America. Technology at the American workplace could help rescue American free enterprise from its present dilemma. The answer will not be achieved, however, unless the American worker possesses education and training which is, at least, state of the art. Our post-industrial, high-tech society of today demands the highest educational level of the mass population in the history of the United States.

Thanks, in part, to the keeping America at work task force of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees, major U.S. corporations have now become aware of an invaluable, immeasurable national resource which is readily available to meet the challenge of raising their workforces to the levels necessary for successful competition in the world marketplace. This national resource is the 1,220 community, junior and technical colleges which are located in almost every congressional district across America. Apparently, our Department of Defense has not recognized this great national resource as it is presented, Senator Thurmond, in your S. 801. Senator Thurmond, I

thank you for acknowledging this great national resource in your introductory remarks when you introduced the bill in the Senate.

I am confident that the members of this subcommittee recognize the problems and successes in meeting the recruiting and retention goals of our All-Volunteer Armed Forces. Many believe that the Air Force represents the glamour service of the military and is better able, therefore, to meet its recruitment and retention rates. The Air Force however still has some problems.

In the current July issue of Air Force, the monthly publication of the Air Force association, Ben Catlin, the Association's assistant executive director for defense, manpower and reserve affairs, has an article entitled "In Prospect for People." Ben's article contains these two observations which are pertinent to S. 801. They are, and I quote, "for the third consecutive year last year, Air Force retention rates improved across the board. First-term reenlistments were up 9 percentage points to 66 percent (it was 38 percent in 1979), and career reenlistments rose from 90 percent to 92 percent (this rate was only 60 percent in 1979). However, major shortages continue to exist in the noncommissioned (NCO) supervisory grades of E–5 through E–7, even though total manning is at authorized levels . . . the Air Force can expect to see a decline in enlistment and reenlistment rates as the economy continues to recover and as competition increases for the declining number of high school graduates in the private sector. The problem will become more acute in the future as the population of 18- to 25-year-olds drops." End of Ben Catlin's statement.

The demand for highly skilled technicians who possess a two-year associate degree with strong math, science and communication skills has and will continue to increase not only in the manufacturing sector but in all sectors of our society as we move ever closer to the year 2000. The same certainly applies to the military, and competition for these people is already strong in business and industry today. Studies and analyses predict that the competition will intensify due to demographic realities and technological advancements.

With the backdrop of the scenario that I have just painted and with your awareness that I am a community/technical college zealot, you must logically be asking the questions, "what's in this for the educator? Are these two-year college leadership people empire builders, in view of the fact that just a few short years ago they began enrolling more freshman each year than did the four-year colleges and universities?" I would amplify your question that more than half of these students are enrolled in occupationally specific engineering and business technologies, allied health technologies and other occupationally specific programs.

In response to the question "what's in it for the two-year college people," I offer a very sincere and direct answer. We believe that S. 801 is good for America . . . good for our educational system, good for our military, good for our economy, and good for the people of the United States. If given a chance, the two-year colleges can contribute to our military strength and, consequently, to our capacity to deter. We understand the mandate to maximize our Nation's greatest resource which will, in turn, promote the economic strength and military strength of our Nation. By so doing, we help insure that our heritage of democracy and freedom is nurtured, maintained and secured.

It has come to the attention of two-year college leaders that the Department of Defense perceives our support of SERTA as an effort to take over training responsibilities of the military. This is not the case. We do believe, however, that, under provisions incorporated in S. 801, we can provide at very low cost to the taxpayer a reliable ongoing source of two-year college engineering and other technicians to the military. One would be hard-pressed to make a case against the advantages of a person entering the armed forces with an associate degree in a program recognized by the Armed Forces as meeting a specific, identified need. For example, an electronics engineering technology graduate versus a high school graduate armed with only a general education. The availability of the two-year college graduate, armed with only a general education. The availability of the two-year college graduate, armed with an associate degree technical speciality will enable, without question, the armed forces to better operate and support cutting edge high tech weapons systems. That, gentlemen, is just what the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act provides.

It would seem that the ability of the Armed Forces to retain the product of the SERTA program, past the initial three-year enlistment, would be greatly enhanced. On the contrary, if the SERTA graduate decides to separate from the military after the three-year commitment, then our Nation will still gain, by having another source of trained, experienced technicians. This fact in itself will lessen the competition between military, business and industry for the vital technician presently in short supply and also those projected to be in short supply.

In the few remaining moments that you have given me, I will touch on a few specifics of S. 801.

On page 3, subsection 6 of section 2, line 13, is the reference that community and technical colleges have the resources and capabilities to provide training in the technical specialties required by the Armed Forces. I offer a resounding "yes" to this statement. Indeed, I amplify on the point to make sure that the committee understands that there are today ongoing engineering technologies and other programs that produce technicians needed by the Armed Forces. These programs operate with the support of faculty, equipment and laboratories necessary to produce graduates with the ability to work succwessfully in business and industry. They are finding little difficulty in securing jobs. Granted, a given industry has to orient a graduate to its particular specialty or manufacturing process. A similar parallel would prevail with the military, and we, as community college leaders, recognize this fact. Industry and business seek most agressively these graduates every day. Could not the military do the same? SERTA presents a mechanism whereby the military could command a premier postion in acquiring these much-sought-after graduates.

Page 5, subsection 3, line 7, of the definitions chapter defines educatonal institution and requires that the approved institutions be accredited by accrediting agencies recognized by the Secretary of Education. I suggest that to further strengthen this definition that specific program accreditation (such as abet for electronics engineering technology) be required where such accreditation is available. The requirement would further assure the Department of Defense of quality control.

Page 5, section 2152, line 17, contains provisions to establish specified programs with appropriate service agreements. On page 6, line 1 of the same section, the power to enter into agreements with qualified persons lies with the appropriate secretary. This is as it should be. Many of us in two-year colleges have envisioned a few geographically dispersed pilot programs which would produce graduates in specialties that are in high demand by the military. These pilot programs could operate a few years and prove or disprove the validity of the SERTA initiative. The Secretary, as noted in S. 801, specifies the technical field in the agreement. This parallels the present modus operandi followed by community colleges across the nation as they respond to the needs of business and industry in meeting their technical manpower requirements. Why should the military be different?

Because I and others had anticipated controversy on a particular area of the bill, I have informally researched that point. I presented the concept embodied in SERTA to members of the Armed Forces who possess advanced non-commissioned rank. They understood the concept and, in all cases, they readily understood SERTA's intent and raised only one concern, that being the pay grade. Most felt an E–8 pay grade would be too high and create morale problems with those already in service and who had advanced through the ranks to the E–5 to E–8 range. I strongly urge the committee, Senator Thurmond, to carefully evaluate and review the proposed pay grade range of E–3 to E–8 as contained in your proposed measure and possibly revise the range by specifying an entering pay grade of E–3, E–4 or E–5.

One of the major points contained in S. 801 is that of providing payment of the educational expenses incurred by the student. It is of paramount importance that the committee recognize and focus on the fact that community college tuition and fees are extremely low when compared with senior public institutions, and most certainly low when compared with senior public institutions, and most certainly low when compared with senior private institutions. The requirement to limit payment of expenses to those normally incurred by all other students at the college is most appropriate. The payment of tuition and fees to those accepted into the program, however, provides an avenue for many worthy young high school graduates to continue their education and serve their country. The stipend represents an added attraction and incentive comparable to the existing community/technical college work-study and technical scholarship programs. This should reinforce the competitive posture of the military for those young people they need and desire.

The basic training provision which requires prior approval to beginning the program at the college has been viewed from the inception of the SERTA concept as necessary and appropriate. To a great degree, this feature parallels the now-accepted ROTC programs. One would have to do minimal research into the history and beginning of ROTC to discover that the ROTC was resisted at the onset. ROTC today is a viable supply line for the nation's military leadership, second only to the service academies. Today's world mandates the availability of a strong supply of technicians not only in the military but in business and industry, as well.

Page 10, section 2156, line 1, prescribes regulations for the approval of courses of technical training and clearly defines that a given institution approve a program

which has been in operation for a period of time. This important proviso insures that colleges will not initiate programs only to meet military shortages. At the same time, it prevents expensive start-up costs for equipment and facilities.

Assistance to educational institutions, as addressed in section 2157, page 10, relating to cost of instructional systems and equipment and course or curriculum development costs, in questionable. I firmly believe that a sufficient number of ongoing programs producing graduates in the specialty areas are now available to more than meet the objectives of SERTA. Community and technical colleges should not be enticed into a SERTA program with the lure of new instructional equipment or the purchase of training systems. Indeed, they should have a clear, proven track record sustained over several years and recognized by business and industry as well as by specific program accrediting agencies.

Another important observation that I should make is that community and technical colleges across the Nation use retired military personnel to teach and manage. These people are available in most communities and are capable of providing the necessary administrative support for SERTA programs in the community/technical colleges.

In conclusion, I offer for your careful consideration and for the consideration of the military establishment within the Department of Defense the rationale that SERTA does not replace any program now in operation to supply technically trained manpower for the Armed Forces. It does offer, indeed, a strong supplement which can only complement existing programs. Most importantly, SERTA can be the best defense investment ever, an investment which will insure maximum return on the taxpayer's dollar, an investment which will insure a stronger defense deterrent posture for America and for the great heritage of freedom which is cherished so much by mankind.

One of the Founding Fathers of our Nation who, by the way, advocated institutions like the 1,200 plus American-invented community colleges, presented a principle that still rings true today. It was Thomas Jefferson who said, "a nation that expects to be ignorant and free expects what never was and never will be." I cannot think of the SERTA bill without thinking of that principle.

I appreciate the honor that you have presented me, Senator Thurmond, by allowing me to share my thoughts on S. 801. I thank you for your vision and foresight by introducing the proposal. Please be assured that the Nations 1,200 plus community-based colleges remain and will continue to remain an immeasurable national resource. We sincerely hope that the Department of Defense and Congress will clearly acknowledge and maximize this immeasurable resource represented by America's community technical colleges.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you, Dr. Garrison, for the fine contribution you made here. It might be well if I would, before we started some questions, introduce some of the staff members who are here, so you'll know who they are.

From the Senate Armed Services Committee, we have Mr. Pat Tucker, and we have Mr. Ken Johnson. And from my staff, we have Mr. Bob Infinger and Mr. Thad Strom.

From Congressman Hartnett's staff we have Mr. Bob Pickering. We're very glad to have all of you gentlemen here, and we thank you for your appearance and what you're doing to promote this hearing.

We invited Senator Hollings and Congressman Hartnett. Congressman Hartnett sent a staff member, Mr. Pickering. Is anyone representing Senator Hollings here? I don't believe so.

I would like to reiterate again very briefly some of the purposes of this act. It is designed to lessen present and projected shortages in skilled, technical, and military occupational specialties.

Next, men and women who qualify for the program would receive the equivalent of a 2-year scholarship at a technical or community college.

Next, following basic training, an individual would enroll in a specific technical education program needed by one of the services.

Next, upon successful completion of the program, the individual would have a 2- or 4-year active duty service requirement followed by a Reserve component commitment, or the individual could elect a 6-year obligation totally in a Reserve component.

Next, the program would be controlled by the service Secretarties to tailor it to the specific needs of each service. I think that in brief summarizes it.

Do any of you have any further suggestions on the summarization of this bill?

Now, we'll pass on then to some questions.

Dr. Darrow, I believe you touched briefly on the issue of the value of the general education students will receive under this program. Now, based upon your experience as the head of the Air Force Community College, would you comment further on the question of whether the general education which would be provided the students under this bill would be of value to the armed services?

Dr. DARROW. Yes, Senator. I think it's of immeasurable value. The acquisition of skills is still done in a traditional manner as we all know in a classroom environment. Once a student acquires the basic skills necessary to perform the military function or task, then that person has not only a requirement but a pressing need to be able to:

No. 1, be able to stay updated, which is done primarily by reading military technical manuals or publications in the field, reports of innovations, maintenance reports, inspection reports, so forth and so on.

So, first of all, talking about the general education component of the communication skills, the ability to read and understand written materials is imperative in any specialty, primarily in a fast moving technical specialty. A person needs to be able to communicate at a very early age in the Armed Forces.

No. 2, we find 18-, 19-, 20-year-old young people who become supervisors, crew chiefs on airplanes, et cetera who have four, five, and six people—probably one grade lower in rank—that they have a very early requirement to become supervisors of. And certainly, communication as a management skill and the ability to discuss and understand things, is a general education skill.

I just wanted to give you two examples. General education is absolutely imperative. We cannot honor a person who is a technical expert only. That person has a limited role in the Armed Forces.

Did I adequately respond to your question?

Senator THURMOND. Thank you very much.

Dr. DARROW. This is a bonus in the SERTA bill. Because in their 2-year training program, they will be getting the full measure of general education courses in the technical training. The military provides up-front technical skills in a very compressed time period.

Let's take electronic technician which is across the services. Rather than spending 2 years producing this person, they typically do it (Air Force), in about 7 months, from 6 to 8 hours a day 5 days a week in class.

So they're concentrating on the technical skills. The difference being the 2-year college spreads it over a 2-year period, same content; but they interject general education requirement in with it. But the technical content, sir, is exactly the same.

Ohm's law hasn't changed and electrons still flow in one direction. The computer keyboard is the same whether it's that IBM in the Pentagon or one at this community college. These things have not changed. They are standard types of technical training. We are not addressing the specialized-type training.

Senator THURMOND. In other words, SERTA which is short for this bill that I've introduced, should become law; and the advantage would be that the student would not only receive the technical education that he would receive in the service, but he would also receive the general education benefit?

Dr. DARROW. Exactly.

Senator THURMOND. Is that correct?

Dr. DARROW. At a greatly reduced cost to the taxpayer.

Senator THURMOND. At a greatly reduced cost?

Dr. DARROW. Greatly. The figures I quoted were figures recently received from Congressman Bennett. They are figures that I tried for years to get when I was in the military and could not. You take $276 million and divide it by 15,000 students, and that's very expensive training. Over $18,000. Very expensive training.

Senator THURMOND. Now, I'm going to ask a question I would like for Dr. LeCroy and Dr. Orth and Dr. Garrison to all answer in turn. If each of you would comment briefly on the types of courses now in being at each of your schools which could be immediately utilized by the armed services without any changes being made to those courses.

Dr. LECROY. I will start, Senator. We have over 100 technical programs offered in the Dallas County community colleges. I can't name all of them for you, but those that come to mind are data processing, electronics, avionics, diesel mechanics, auto mechanics, all the building trades, quality control, right down the line of elements that would be required by the services.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Orth?

Dr. ORTH. Sir, this past year, we have been offering 41 different programs at Trident Technical College, and I would say that probably at least 35 to 39 of those are in the areas that would be immediately transferable, like the ones Dr. LeCroy said, in the business area, in the secretarial areas for the clerk typist, aviation maintenance technology, automotive technologies, engineering, architectural engineering, chemical engineering technologies.

I think they would support providing a better technical base for further training.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Garrison?

Dr. GARRISON. Senator, we administer approximately 30 ongoing programs. Of course, our institution, as you well know, is not all that large, but we do enroll right around 3,800 degree/diploma students every year in those 30 programs. And they range from electronic engineering technology—and I personally believe that's one of the more needed programs in all branches of the service, because the high tech today in electronics to a great degree—to data processing, computer science, the allied health areas, nursing. We don't offer dental hygiene. I think Dr. Orth offers dental hygiene here, and I know Dr. LeCroy does, and the Alabama system does. But those are typical examples.

But even areas such as auto mechanics and on across the board. There are literally hundreds across the country of the occupationally specific programs that do produce graduates that are needed for the military.

Senator THURMOND. Well, thank you very much.

Are you Mr. Martin or Dr. Martin?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Martin. I'm the only one here without a doctorate.

Senator THURMOND. At any rate, Mr. Martin, you expressed concern about artificial pressures on this program. I was wondering if you would describe in more detail the types of pressures about which you are concerned.

Mr. MARTIN. Senator, I don't know that any artificial pressures would be exerted. I certainly don't anticipate any that would be, but I would not like to see any that might come about which would diminish the product. To me the product is supreme and has to be protected at all costs.

As I thought about it and concerned myself with what might happen in the future, that thought prevailed, that the product has to be protected in this case. The product is our young men and our young women who serve in our Armed Forces who are to protect this Nation, who are to take care of the equipment and the personnel who are, so to speak, in the trenches and in the front lines.

And they then become supreme, and protection of their training so that they can perform the mission to me stayed at the top of the hill.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you very much.

Dr. Garrison, would you like to comment on that?

Dr. GARRISON. Thank you, Senator. I really wanted to speak to that point. I'm glad you asked that question. These occupationally specific programs that we speak of, the content of those programs almost to the 100 percent level, except for the general education component—and even there, even with that component, it's true—to a high degree are dictated by business and industry. Because they buy the product.

And the product of these programs that are ongoing today that we're talking about, that curriculum is not governed by academic freedom in the community colleges. And we all subscribe to academic freedom, but community colleges are a little different breed than the 4-year institutions across the land.

The 2-year technical community college is an American institution. It's an American invention. And it came into being because of changes in our society in the communities and the need for this manpower-level person, the technician, to a great degree. That's the chunk of the rationale.

So, the quality there, question, is certainly important but one that's invalid in my judgment in the context of SERTA; because if we don't turn out a quality product to business and industry in the communities that these colleges reside in, then those colleges are going to close their doors, in a sense. They're going to know about it.

So we operate a high accountability level there. And, of course, if we can meet the needs of business and industry—and we are meet-

ing those—can we not do the same thing for the military? That, to me, is a fundamental question.

Senator THURMOND. Now, I'm going to propound a few questions, and you gentlemen can answer them, whoever wants to speak up first; or we can alternate among you.

Much of the current training in military schools is tied to military unique equipment such as military aircraft or combat vehicles. In many instances, that equipment is used in the schoolhouse for hands-on training and supports the total annual training requirements for a single military specialty at a single location.

S. 801 does provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to provide material assistance to provide course training. With this fact notwithstanding, are civilian institutions willing to make the necessary investment in military unique equipment needed to support training of a comparable nature to that currently provided in military schools? Dr. Darrow?

Dr. DARROW. Senator, I would like to address that. There is a misconception among those in and associated with the military with regards to SERTA directly approaching that question. This bill was not conceived nor designed to conduct military specialized training. It was not designed to do that.

Let me give you an example of some of the things it's designed to do. I'll go away from the Air Force to the Army. The Army has a lot of trucks. I understand. Well, truck driving is a course or program taught in the 2-year colleges. We don't teach tank driving, and we don't intend to teach tank driving.

However, within that tank are engines, diesel engines in many of them, and diesel engines, pardon the expression, are diesel engines. And the basic repair of diesel engines is taught very well in our community colleges.

The communications gear in a tank is primarily standardized communication gear with some specific applications. The majority of the training for the people who repair the communications gear in the tank is the same identical training conducted in our community and junior colleges.

As spinoff on that aspect, the concept would be that the 2-year college graduate in communications, electronics, or whatever the particular program title, would then go on to specialized training. And that is exactly the way the military conducts its training.

They have the basic phases. For example, I used Keesler Air Force Base which has an electronics school that is approximately 7 months long covering basic electronics. That person then goes on through a number of processes in the Air Force, including on-the-job training, to use specialized training.

So my answer is that the 2-year colleges do not intend to get into the position where they have any need to acquire specialized military training equipment. That's my concept of SERTA.

Senator THURMOND. Any other comments?

Dr. LECROY. I would add that if any of the Secretaries wished to provide equipment and asked that the community colleges provide some specialized training, we certainly would be open to do that. But that's not the purpose of this bill. But we're prepared to do that and would if asked.

Senator THURMOND. As I understand your position, you feel that you are qualified now to do most of the training; but if there is any little particular training that you don't do that the services want, you can do that if they'll provide the equipment?

Dr. LECORY. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. Is that the answer?

Dr. LECROY. Yes, sir.

Dr. DARROW. Yes, sir.

Dr. GARRISON. But, Senator, I think though, we need to state this. Again, Dr. Darrow stated a moment ago, it is not our intent, the 2-year college community, to do the specialized training.

Senator THURMOND. Now, would you draw a line to let me get that clear, now?

Dr. GARRISON. I think I can make it pretty clear pretty quick. Today at our college, or this past year, we enrolled some 14,000 people. Now, I know that's amazing to you for Anderson, Oconee, and Pickens Counties, because you're tuned into that population base, roughly a quarter of a million people.

But those 14,000 that I speak of are people who are employed who are in upskilling, updating, nonspecialized noncredit specialized courses. The military has to conduct their own specialized courses like that. But at the same time that we dealt with those 14,000, we dealt with another 3,800 that are enrolled in these occupationally specific programs that will graduate that are either 1 year in length, or 2 years. Those that are 2 years will graduate with an associate degree.

And it's that product that SERTA addresses, not the specialized retraining. So I think the military is always going to have to indoctrinate our graduates, that they would come out of this SERTA program to the same degree that an industry in our community, say Michelin Tire, has to indoctrinate the graduate to their specific application. So the parallels are——

Senator THURMOND. How much time would that save by the training you give them?

Dr. GARRISON. Well, I've asked this of any number of people, and I never get the same answer—the military. I never get the same answer. But, to me, there is a very simple way to express that. Which would a person, say, in the Air Force prefer that it was responsible for training, a high school graduate from a quality high school, a quality high school graduate—and they're not getting all these quality graduates that we think who are of this quality, because many of them are coming out of the schools of this Nation with a high school diploma in hand achieving seventh- or eighth-grade levels; and many of those, the bulk of those, are entering into the service.

But which would you rather have, a person right out of high school to train as an electronic specialist—let's get it down, define it as fine as we can—to train that electronic technician specialist person for the Air Force? Would you rather start with with a 2-year college associate degree in electronic engineering technology, an accredited graduate, or a graduate of an accredited course administered by a 2-year college that is regionally accredited by an appropriate accrediting agency, or just a high school graduate?

It would be clear to me and, I think, to most logical people that certainly you would rather start with a better product. And then by doing so, you don't have to teach all of the Ohm's law that Colonel Darrow referred to and all of these other basics. And you don't have to worry about the washout or dropout rate. That's already been absorbed by the college.

The armed services would end up with a finished product. That's the key to our special schools program in the South Carolina TEC system whereby we train people for industry. A new industry coming in, as you know, they end up with a quality product, the people that they offer the job to, and so they don't suffer the turnover rate.

And that's one of our biggest sales points that we make in attracting an industry to stay. The principle holds true again with a SERTA program. That's a long answer, but——

Dr. DARROW. Let me add real briefly one bonus to this, Senator. This illustration that Dr. Garrison provided has another benefit to the military services. With their current mode of training, their productivity, that time spent outside of training is reduced by the amount of training time. The product of SERTA starts their productive time when they come on active duty.

So whatever time this training is, it comes right out of that equation and that person has this behind them. They enter the service with a 2-, 3-, or 4-year, whatever it is, term of enlistment. They don't enter the service and then go through basic training and then go through technical training and then go to work.

So that's just another bonus which is going to directly affect retention in the fact that this person will be productive for a much longer period of time even if he or she only stays for that initial enlistment. We have training programs within the services that take more than 3 years.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you. Dr. Orth, do you wish to comment on that?

Dr. ORTH. I agree very definitely, with Dr. Garrison, that the higher level an individual enters with—if indeed we brought in technicians at the 4-year bachelor technology level—the better prepared they are to go into the training. A 4-year technician would be better than at the 2-year period.

The level of education that an individual, has does affect the training that must be done by the military. My understanding was, however, that SERTA would provide a basic foundation of knowledge in a given skill, upon which the services would still be required to build.

The question you asked, which I can't really answer, of what amount of training will be reduced from the military training load by this program is a difficult one, but an extremely critical one. I doubt that when any individual comes into active duty that they will indeed become productive immediately, because we have all said they will require specialized training.

Now, I don't know from Dr. Darrow, how many of these 3 years of training in the specialities that he's referring to are general fundamental education which the SERTA bill would provide or are indeed specialized training. If all 3 years of it are general with

none of it specialized, then the individual would come in needing quite a bit of training.

I believe there will always be some portion of a 4-year enlistment which will be spent in specialized training to come up to speed in the task the individual is required to do in the military.

Senator THURMOND. In other words, you feel, as I understand it, that the community colleges and technical colleges, as we call them in this State, could probably do most of their training; but if there is some additional specialized training, then the service would be expected to do it?

Dr. ORTH. Yes, sir; I would look at the almost complete analogy to the ROTC in the officers' corps. I think, for example, in the Air Force there are certain people who go through the ROTC Program in the computer science area, at an accredited institution as Dr. Garrison said.

When they come into the service, they then go through a school to specifically train them for their job. That military school is based upon the level of information they have as a starting point. I would anticipate that the SERTA bill would do exactly the same thing for the enlisted corps.

It would, as Dr. Garrison has said, provide a better qualified individual on the fundamentals that will then make it a much easier task for the specific service to bring the individual up to speed in the specifics necessary for defense.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you. Dr. LeCroy, do you have anything further on that?

Dr. LECROY. No, sir; I would like to make one comment. I would like to let you know that even though I did not talk to Senator Tower, one of my trustees has. And I will talk to him personally, as well.

Senator THURMOND. That will be very helpful. Now, let's move on to the potential cost savings. If S. 801 were enacted, some attempt would have to be made to integrate the educational benefits within the current recruiting and enlistment bonus programs in order to reduce cost.

What are your views on how this should be done most effectively. Dr. Darrow, do you want to answer that?

Dr. LECROY. I'm not sure I understand the question.

Dr. DARROW. I would like to be unkind and ask you to repeat the question, Senator.

Senator THURMOND. If S. 801 were enacted, some attempt would have to be made to integrate the educational benefits within the current recruiting and enlistment bonus programs in order to reduce cost.

What are your views on how this should be done most effectively.

Dr. DARROW. Let me just attempt a response, and it may generate some thinking along the other panel members. There are a multitude of monetary incentives at any one given point in time to attract young people into the military. I'm not familiar with all of them.

I'm familiar with a few of them that were effective a few years ago in the Air Force. We know about certain things. For example, the Junior ROTC Program offers an incentive, which is a return on monetary investment.

A junior ROTC product out of a high school can come into the Air Force as an enlisted person in the third level, E–3 rather than E–1. There's a stripes for college program which allows an E–2 for approximately, I think, 30 hours and E–3 for 45 hours. I understand the Navy has some extremely lucrative offers.

My youngest son, who is a senior in high school, has received a very nice letter with a lot of dollar signs in it to become some kind of a person that works in nuclear submarines, although the literature didn't say submarine.

So there's just a multitude of offerings. The GI bill is a back side. SERTA could be looked at like an up-front GI bill. I don't really have the knowledge to give you cost figures, but there has to be a significant reduction in this, because you don't offer the SERTA person anything except a subsidized 2-year college program.

What they give back is some 2, 3, or 4, whatever the rules are, years of time on active duty or significantly in the National Guard or Reserve.

My oldest son is a member of the Alabama Air National Guard. And the program that was in effect 2 years ago and that he entered, in fact, it was a significant enticement. They offered him, if he qualified in one of four or five critical skills areas, $1,000 a year to be used for college and entry into the Guard as an enlisted person at the grade of E–3.

He qualified for a 7-month electronics school and has been productive in the National Guard. This is another costly program that would be replaced, in essence, by SERTA.

I didn't give you the full answer. I just kind of talked about some of the things that I'm familiar with. I know the Army and the Navy have many enticing entry programs. The Army has an advertisement, come with us, and we'll give you $25,000 when you get out to go to college. Nuclear submarine bonuses are what, $10,000, $15,000 in some categories? It goes on and on.

This has, as you know, direct relation with input. We went through it in the Air Force with physicians and allied health people. That's diminishing as the number of physicians per population are increasing. We offered—may still do—a direct entry to active duty for a physician into as high a grade as colonel, direct entry from the civilian physician practice into Air Force physician practice.

These are all expensive programs. If one could get data on what this does cost for the typical enlisted person in the Armed Forces, I think it could be useful in your committee deliberations. But good luck getting those figures. They're difficult to obtain.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. LeCroy, did you have anything else?

Dr. LECROY. Yes; I may be putting a different interpretation on your question; but when you say incorporating the educational benefits in the recruiting and enlistment program, that means to me communication of the opportunity to potential enlisted men and women.

Our colleges all allow recruiters on campus and set them up for recruiting. In addition, the SERTA program, we would make well known to the high school counselors and our own counseling staffs. And what you would have, in effect, is arms of the recruiting of-

fices out in the high schools and colleges promoting this opportunity.

So, I think there is a communication network through the counseling staffs that would be a real asset to the recruiting offices.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you. Any other comments?

Dr. GARRISON. Senator, just to follow on a little bit there with Dr. LeCroy's comments. This business of recruiting students is critical. We have any number of people that work with the high schools that Dr. LeCroy alluded to, and this is true of these 1,200 colleges across the Nation. The expense involved with that, that investment is already there. It's in place.

And then what those people would do in presenting the total program opportunities to that given student who's graduating from high school next spring would be through SERTA, that here is a program where you can go to summer camp for indoctrination this summer right after you get out of high school.

I don't know what the investment would be for that on the part of the military, but it would be a minimal one. They would receive some compensation for that. They would have a full scholarship. And that's low-cost upfront investment of public funds, because a college tuition for community colleges is extremely low all over the Nation.

In fact, in California, it was nonexistent until this year. And to me, that's the key to enhancing the input of people into the military. It's another avenue that's available to many of those kids that today still can't afford, even with the low cost, to go to community college, to technical college. We have them in this State and have them in every community, even though we pride ourself on low tuition.

While they're going, they have to make another investment. They're not paid a salary as they would be in the military as they're undergoing all this basic, fundamental training. They're staying at home, so they're clothing themselves, and they're purchasing their own food, or their parents are. So, that cost is wiped out from the military. And then go in for some kind of advanced rank.

And in return for that investment on the part of the Government and on the part of the person, you get a 3-year commitment as presently incorporated into the bill. And I think you need to take a good look at that and maybe make that 4 years. I don't think making that 4 years would be a deterrent.

The military gets this trained technician. They have a greater ability to retain that person. And even if they don't retain them, that person goes back into the private sector with all that military experience plus the 2-year college degree, and then they just lessen the competition that the Armed Forces has. To get the people that they're looking for, they have to compete with business and industry.

So, there are all kinds of incentives here begging the investment of public resources into this program to create another avenue of supply to the military.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you very much.

Dr. Orth, do you have any further comment?

Dr. ORTH. No, sir.

Senator THURMOND. Now, there's one area of potential savings that I would like to explore further, and it was raised in the Congressional Budget Office report to the House Armed Services Committee. The report points out that nonprofit schools typically do not charge fees to recover the full cost of their programs from their students. Offsets to operating cost include tax-deductible contributions, non-Government grants, and State and local government contributions.

Can you provide insight into the extent that these offsets reduce the cost of education in 2-year colleges and technical schools?

Dr. GARRISON. Senator, I can give you an approximate percentage figure. Our student-generating revenue at Tri-County Technical College is somewhere around 20 percent of our total expenditure. All other funds come from either local government, or State government, and then a good bit comes from specialized programmatic money, such as title III money that you're familiar with of the Higher Ed Act.

So the investment—and that's another beautiful point that supports this bill—is already there. And the bulk of it is already in the form of local tax dollars that go to the college or the State tax dollars, and the student investment is simply minimal.

And that's the investment that we're talking about, basically, that would be made in SERTA. That and the stipend would be the biggest bulk of the cost.

Dr. LECROY. Senator, may I just reiterate what Don has said? What we will be doing is utilizing this resource that is in place supported by State and local taxes to help educate young men and women to fill the technical needs of the military and then of the industrial support of the military.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you. Now, I understand we've got a luncheon scheduled here at 12:30, so we'll have to try and finish in about 10 minutes.

Now, assuming that the proposed legislation is passed, all accredited vocational and technical institutions would compete for hosting selected training. Current service procedures include a provision for continuous evaluation to support changing job requirements. This procedure is simplified, because the training is centralized.

How would schools interested in conducting training propose to continue this process of evaluation under the decentralized situation expected if the legislation is approved?

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Darrow, do you want to answer?

Dr. DARROW. I'm going to draw my experience on two separate times with the U.S. Air Force with ROTC and Junior ROTC, because those are programs which are conducted on civilian institutions and civilian high schools and yet administered by and quality checked, input and output, by the military.

I would propose for the Air Force, which I'm familiar with—the Air Force has a centralized activity that conducts all of the junior ROTC, and all of the senior ROTC from Maxwell Air Force Base, one central unit.

And the procedure could be, at least initially, patterned after the same way those programs are. If a senior college wants to start a college ROTC program, they have an application process, and they

have people who look into their curriculum and the availability of facilities, student availability, students' SAT, ACT scores, so forth, and then work with the university to reach an agreement.

With the high schools, it's done in a very similar manner. The high schools apply. The Air Force alone has close to 300 high school programs. The other services have probably that many, so we know we already have probably as many junior ROTC units in existence as there are proposed technical college programs.

And the administration of this is not a burden. It is not costly. The quality control checks are there as prescribed by the individual service, both acquisition training and quality of output. So I think administratively, there are many, many patterns the military already has that could be utilized.

I do not see this as a burden or a problem or a major expense at all. The cooperation is excellent between high schools and the Air Force and between colleges and the Air Force. There is an occasional university who wants to remove the ROTC unit, and there is a procedure for that.

Fortunately, for every one who wants to lose one, there is a waiting list who want to acquire one.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. LeCroy, did you want to comment?

Dr. LECROY. Yes, sir. I believe the question may be, assuming, again, that there would be more specialized training, because we have in place our regional accrediting associations that police the quality of what goes on at these accredited institutions. And we would again be teaching basic skills in electronics, and those are policed by the accrediting associations.

So, I think the liaison that may be presumed by the question would be minimal, absolutely minimal, if not zero, because you've got quality control elements already in place, and we're providing training for the diesel mechanic, the auto mechanic, or the electronics technician, or the data processing technician.

Dr. ORTH. Senator Thurmond, I don't want this to be a controversial view, but I would disagree with that. I think this is one of the critical points, and I believe there would be significant problems caused by how the faculty views its responsibility toward curriculum.

I understand what Dr. Darrow says about the ROTC, both at the college level and at the high school level. However, the emphasis is primarily on the quality of the ROTC courses which are being taught—those established by ROTC headquarters.

To my knowledge, the services have been in a situation where they are looking at the quality of particular college courses within a program and how those are changed. Now, from an educational standpoint, what the services are doing now with their very strict quality control and standardization of training is very debateable. There is a question of whether that degree of control is appropriate from an educational standpoint.

That is something that is generally not done in higher education. Some say that accreditation is a control. But accreditation, as I think you are aware, and the Senate is very aware, sir, is being questioned on its capability to control the specific quality of particular courses. Yet, the military system is heavily relying on that degree of control.

I believe this is an area where there would be conflict. I believe that can be resolved by having, as they do with the ROTC, a military installation on the campus which has responsibility for quality control with the courses that directly support the military.

You've identified an issue that will have conflict in the implementation. I think it can be worked out, but it will be a difficult one.

Senator THURMOND. Now, I'm wondering if you gentlemen would see fit to write me a letter and tell me what suggestions you'd make or any changes in this legislation that you feel would be helpful.

In view of the hearing this morning, maybe there is some suggestion you have for some change, or what changes you suggest to clarify situations. In other words, I would like to have your recommendations, that before this bill is finally passed, if it is passed, what do you think would be helpful and ways to change it to improve it.

Would you do that?

Dr. LECROY. Yes, sir.

Dr. ORTH. Yes, sir.

Dr. GARRISON. Yes, sir.

Dr. DARROW. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. I want to express my deep appreciation to you, Mr. Martin, Dr. Darrow, Dr. Garrison, Dr. Orth, and Dr. LeCroy for your presence here, and I want to assure you that your discussion on this bill this morning has been most helpful. We have enjoyed having you here.

Now, you follow up that with letters and make any recommendations you see fit. Now, we're going to stop for lunch in just a minute. However, there may be some in the audience that have some comments. I think we ought to give them a chance.

Is there any military person or anyone else in the audience who would like to comment on this bill or any discussion that's taken place here this morning?

Hearing none, I assume they feel it has been covered to their satisfaction. We stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

○